

REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action dated February 27, 2009. Claims 42-82 were pending in the application at the time of examination.

Claims 42-46, 49, 51, 52, 55-69, 72, 74-79, 81 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,804,957 (“Selph”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,157,721 (“Shear”).

Claims 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selph in view of Shear and in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,978,475 (“Schneier”).

Claims 47, 48, 50, 70, 71, 73 and 80 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The rejections from the Office Action dated February 27, 2009 are discussed below. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks.

I. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

With respect to independent claim 42, dependent claim 47 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have amended independent claim 42 to include all of the limitations of dependent claim 47 and intervening claim 45. As such, claim 42 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 43-44, 46 and 48-64 depend from claim 42, and therefore are also in condition for allowance.

With respect to independent claim 65, dependent claim 70 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have amended independent claim 65 to include all of the limitations of dependent claim 70 and intervening claim 68. As such, claim 65 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 66-67, 69 and 71-76 depend from claim 65, and therefore are also in condition for allowance.

With respect to independent claim 77, dependent claim 80 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in

independent form. Applicants have amended independent claim 77 to include all of the limitations of dependent claim 80. As such, claim 77 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 78-79 and 81-82 depend from claim 77, and therefore are also in condition for allowance.

With respect to new independent claim 83, dependent claim 50 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form. New independent claim 83 includes all of the limitations of original independent base claim 42 and dependent claim 50. As such, new claim 83 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to new independent claim 84, dependent claim 73 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form. New independent claim 84 includes all of the limitations of original independent base claim 65 and dependent claim 73. As such, new claim 84 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated February 27, 2009 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of pending claims 42-44, 46, 48-67, 69, 71-79 and 81-84 are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if such communication would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas A. Oguss
Registration No. 48,469
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: May 18, 2009

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200